

New York Tribune

First to Last—The Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 1916.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Capital \$1,000,000. President, G. V. Vorse, Treasurer, J. H. Vorse, Secretary, J. H. Vorse. Address: Tribune Building, No. 123 Nassau Street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily, 5 cents; 3 months, \$1.50; 6 months, \$2.85; 1 year, \$5.00. Daily and Sunday, 10 cents; 3 months, \$3.00; 6 months, \$5.50; 1 year, \$10.00. Sunday only, 5 cents; 3 months, \$1.50; 6 months, \$2.85; 1 year, \$5.00.

FOREIGN RATES: CANADIAN RATES: DAILY AND SUNDAY. One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.85; 6 months, \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00. DAILY ONLY. One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.85; 6 months, \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00. SUNDAY ONLY. One month, \$1.00; 3 months, \$2.85; 6 months, \$5.00; 1 year, \$9.00.

Entered as Second-Class Matter, March 1, 1879.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

Peace, War and Honor.

Apologists for Mr. Wilson are naturally anxious to break the force of the indictment against the Administration's foreign policy drawn by Mr. Root. They profess to welcome the issue raised by Mr. Root's speech on the ground that it must put the Republican party in the attitude of condemning peace and approving war. Thus "The World" said on Thursday: "In so far as Mr. Root has power to commit the Republican party to a foreign policy in opposition to the policy of the Wilson Administration, that policy is a policy of war."

This wholly misrepresents the view of those who have criticized Mr. Wilson's foreign policy. It also misrepresents the attitude of the President and the conditions which he has faced when it suggests that with him it has always been a question simply of preferring peace to war.

No party in this country desires war for war's sake, and no government which the American people would install in power would deliberately seek war. But, on the other hand, no government, simply by wishing it, can avoid war. It takes two to keep the peace. A man can always avoid fighting if he starts to run and keeps on running. But a country cannot run away when it is attacked. Belgium could not run away when the German armies rushed over her eastern border. The United States cannot crawl into its shell, withdraw from all contact with the rest of the world, forbid its citizens to travel on the seas and cease to sell its merchandise abroad. So long as we maintain intercourse with other countries—even with neutrals—we are likely to see our rights abridged by belligerents who are so intent on pursuing their own interests that they care little to what extent they sacrifice ours.

Mr. Wilson has recognized that he is not free to choose peace or war to compel it. In his recent speeches in the West he said that he could not tell what a day or an hour would bring forth; that the United States, though wishing for peace, was liable to be drawn into war at any time by some firebrand act on the part of one or other of the belligerents.

The President has not been at all times for peace at any price. He risked war by intervening in Mexico to oust Huerta, and he actually made war on Huerta's *de facto* Mexican Government. At the beginning of the German submarine campaign he sent the German Government his "strict accountability" letter, which contained a definite threat of war. He played with the idea of war in all the Lusitania notes, hoping that the world would never discover (as it soon did) that what ever firmness there was in them was only a matter of form and phrase.

If the Democratic party expects to make its campaign this year on a platform which insists on an unwavering and unconditional peace policy, the logical nominee for the Presidency is not Mr. Wilson, but Mr. Bryan. Mr. Bryan is openly for peace at any price—including lives and honor. He has favored surrendering rights the exercise of which might bring us into conflict with the belligerent nations. When Secretary of State he ordered all Americans out of Mexico, in order to escape the distasteful duty of demanding protection for their lives and property. After signing the "strict accountability" and other threatening notes to Germany he had the candor to admit that they meant nothing and were written merely for political effect at home. He wanted to forbid American citizens from travelling on the merchant vessels of the nations at war. He was willing to make any renunciation of right and submit to any surrender of neutral privilege which would help to keep the United States clear of controversies with the belligerent powers. He still opposes all measures of military preparedness, because he wants to make the people of this country realize the hopelessness of taking up arms under any provocation or in any cause.

With Mr. Bryan as a candidate the Democratic party and "The World" could have their clear-cut issue—that peace at any price is better than war on any terms. But with Mr. Wilson as a candidate there could be no such issue. The indictment against Mr. Wilson's foreign policy rests on other grounds. The vital trouble with it has been that it didn't mean what it said; that it has been insincere, wavering and futile. The President has failed because he neglected to set himself one clear, definite national task and to stick to that task consistently, whether the outcome for us was peace or war.

It was plain enough in the early days of the fighting in Europe that we could not count with any certainty on keeping out of the trouble zone. War might overtake us as unawares. The first duty of the President at that time was to put the country into a condition to defend itself. But Mr. Wilson ignored this imperative duty. He sneered at those who urged preparation against war and called them "nervous and excited."

showed us on what insecure ground we stood Mr. Wilson remained obdurate and blind. He would not call Congress together to increase the navy and reorganize the army. He wasted seven precious months and then suddenly suffered a conversion to preparedness whose sincerity has yet to be tested and which so far has borne very little fruit.

Writing letters to Germany which on their face invited war, he allowed the world to draw quickly the deduction that there was nothing behind his words. There was nothing and there never had been anything, as Mr. Bryan truly informed the Ambassador of Austria-Hungary.

In Mexico there was a personal intervention directed against an obnoxious Provisional President and supplemented by a programme of agrarian reform for the benefit of the Mexican people. But never was a hand raised to protect American lives and property or to enforce the guarantees to American residents contained in our treaty with Mexico.

Mexican faction leaders have defied us with impunity, just as the German government has postponed for nine months an acknowledgment of the illegality of the massacre of which more than a hundred American passengers on the Lusitania were the victims.

The Wilson foreign policy has failed through not realizing that words are worthless unless backed by deeds—in talking about protecting national interests and honor while shrinking from the consequences of protecting them. Whatever may be the President's innate preference for peace, his letter to Germany of February 10, 1915, carried a clear note of war. It was in effect an ultimatum. Yet stroke by stroke thereafter that ultimatum was softened and the United States was put in the unenviable position of abandoning its high claims as a champion of neutral rights and of the sanctity of international law in order to avoid war and to secure its own material prosperity and tranquillity.

The Wilson diplomacy has made America contemptible in the eyes of the world. It has sinned against the spirit of true Americanism; it has put materialism above national honor.

That is the real indictment which Mr. Wilson's foreign policy must face. It has not banished the peril of war, for, as Mr. Wilson himself admits, war may still come any day. It has merely secured us a week-by-week respite from international trouble by diplomatic twisting and turning. It has belittled American courage and made a mockery of American ideals.

All that Mr. Wilson has really done for peace is to make odious the thought of peace without honor—to turn all true Americans against that semblance of peace which he has purchased and paid for in terms of national humiliation.

Saratoga's Wasted Waters.

The mineral waters of Saratoga's springs have been well and favorably known for many years, but Mr. George Foster Peabody, formerly chairman of the Saratoga Springs Commission, thinks they are not known well enough. "The confidence of physicians in the beneficial qualities of these springs needs to be assisted almost as much as that of the patients," he told an audience of physicians at the Academy of Medicine. And apparently that is true, else there would be a far greater demand for the various waters of that celebrated resort for drinking and for baths.

At present the state bottles and sells some of the waters, and a bathhouse also is operated. But the full capacity of this wonderful gift of nature is not developed. Having acquired the most important of the springs, and protected them against pumping companies so that the waters have been restored to their original quality, the state has neglected to make an adequate appropriation. European spas cost money, but returned large profits. It has been estimated that for an appropriation of \$2,500,000, all of which would not need to be made available at once, the state's plant could be developed to compare favorably with that of any European spa. Indeed, the Reservation Commission says it would then be the most important in the world.

By judicious publicity regarding the genuine merits of the waters and the charms of the village as a resort and by a comparatively small investment for improvements the state might realize a handsome return on its money. It seems shortsighted not to follow Europe's example instead of letting the waters run to waste.

Bonuses.

Mr. Charles M. Schwab has the grand manner. He does things in a big way and he likes to dismiss them with a gesture. Five million in bonuses? Nothing! "Brains are a bigger asset than money. They are essential to the success of any business and should be paid for by the corporations who profit by them."

This is a regally American sentiment. It strikes a responsive chord in all our breasts. And yet a democracy may be pardoned for objecting to the bonus system as a method of reward. It is too reminiscent of absolutism and the caprice of kings. Brains should make their own bargain beforehand and stick to it. To depend upon the impulsive generosity of employers is to invite disappointment and demoralization and injustice.

The trouble lies with the standards of measurement of brain value. Mr. Shonts, of the Interborough, for example, says he earned the bonus which his board of directors voted him. But his words fail to carry full conviction. On the other hand, if he did earn it, for whom was the service rendered—for himself and a small group of insiders with their fingers on the purse strings, or for the great bulk of stockholders? And who is going to pay the stockholders who had very little to

say regarding its presentation, or the public which had even less?

Colonel Williams, of the B. R. T., seems equally convinced that he earned the \$100,000 which his board of directors voted to give him for his share in closing the dual subway contracts, though he considers it none of the public's business. He is not inclined to be as genial about it all as Charlie Schwab, but more like Louis XIV with his "L'Etat, c'est moi." Louis XIV could reward himself or his favorites according to his mood and increase the tax pressure on his subjects to pay for the "brains" he fancied. If he had felt it incumbent on him to make any explanation whatever to his oppressed peasantry he might easily have employed the royal language of Prince Charlie: "Brains are a bigger asset than money. They are essential to the success of any kingdom."

Almost every one is agreed that workers, whether brain or manual, should share in the corporate profits which they help to produce, but not in the feudal manner of the bonus system. This seems particularly intolerable in the case of public service corporations. It is only less so when the giant industries, like the Bethlehem Steel works, are concerned. How much longer must we listen to the discords of industrial feudalism in a political democracy?

As an Object Lesson.

Only one of the Bishops at the Convocation of Canterbury had the hardihood to oppose the resolution condemning reprisals "which have as a deliberate object the killing and wounding of non-combatants." It was drawn up, of course, in opposition to the increasing demand for some answer to the Zeppelin raids, and the Bishop of Bangor, in defence of the popular clamor, made use of the usual argument that if bombs could only be dropped in German cities those who initiated this kind of warfare would instantly condemn it "as a blunder, as inexcusable, as a crime."

If the Bishop of Bangor and the others who reason in this way are right there would be a good enough excuse for reprisals. But why should any one imagine that the Germans would be converted and mend their ways? They have not ceased to use gas since their opponents began to imitate them, and if they were to do so they could have no assurance that their example would be followed in this case, too. For destructive raids they are probably better equipped than the enemy, who have no Zeppelins, and if airplanes were to attack a German town the probable effect would be an increase in the demand for raids on London.

It is surely apparent by now to the Bishop of Bangor and all who think with him that what the Germans might condemn as crimes or cruelties in their foes are applauded as acts of heroism when performed by their own warriors.

It seems that Germany and Mexico are neck and neck in the number of Americans murdered.

Another Snow Storm Whirling Toward City—Headline.

For the privilege of having Fetherston muddle through it.

Bill Barnes would go a-Rooting.

Farreaching Mischief.

(From The Boston Herald.) More than American shipping has been hurt by the Furuseth-La Follette seamen's law. As a correspondent of thirty-five years' residence in the Far East writes in a letter to "The Herald," the action of President Wilson in signing this law has brought censure to all Americans in the Orient, for they foresee the downfall of the entire commercial fabric established there by the labors and sacrifice of three-quarters of a century.

More than the ships have gone. With them have disappeared the American administrative organization at Yokohama, Hong Kong and Shanghai—a large part of the connecting link between the United States and Oriental markets. American managers, agents, clerks, who have spent a lifetime mastering the complexities of Eastern commerce, found their work destroyed when the President affixed his name to this joint production of the California labor agitator and the Wisconsin marplot.

This is the course of trade in foreign ports: First ships appear. To transact their business agencies of their own nationality are requisite. Thus business houses are established. These need again the facilities of banks, and banking institutions follow. It is thus that Great Britain and Germany have built up their powerful mercantile and financial organizations in South America, which before the shock of the great war were working so wonderfully for British or German interests all the time.

Without a similar organization, say men who know the United States can never break into South American commerce and the same is unfortunately true of the Orient. When President Wilson killed American shipping in the Eastern seas he killed also the whole organization founded on this American shipping business.

Honor to a Woman Artist.

(From The Philadelphia Ledger.) The award of its gold medal for general excellence by the Architectural League to Miss Violet Oakley, of Philadelphia, is the just recognition of extraordinary talent, and the occasion is noteworthy as the first of such awards to a woman. Miss Oakley, in her beautiful handiwork, has never been content with the display of technique or the ornamental function of a decorator whose sole aim is to fill a space with a picture. She has wrought with a patient cunning to convey a message in fidelity to truth and the wisdom of the spirit. There are subtleties of mysticism behind and through the literal delineation: the figures of her William Penn pictures, or of the House of Wisdom, or of the Dante window, are sacred to her creator as the abiding realities of life. Miss Oakley's gift to her own time is distinguished, for it is the refining antithesis of whatever things are gross and abominable in the delirium of the world that God has made. The voice of it speaks for peace in righteousness and righteousness in peace. It would draw all peoples if it could, by the constraining hand of the power of the truth, to the beauty of holiness. Because the note it strikes is so high, so fine, it is not always heard; that the Architectural League has recognized its paramount quality reflects credit on the discernment of that body, as well as upon the artist's work.

WILSON DEPLORABLE FAILURE

Some Strong Commendation of The Tribune's Editorials.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I want to thank you for the many course you are taking in denouncing as you have in some of your editorials the incompetence, insincerity and total lack of all sense of national honor shown by the Wilson Administration. I wish especially to mention "Cash," in the issue of January 26; "A Dishonoring Proposal," February 8, and "Too Proud to Fight," February 10. It seems to me that Mr. Wilson's course has done more harm to the country than have the combine mistakes of all the other Presidents.

There is no need for me to recount here the different ways in which he has brought harm upon it, for they are plain to all who will stop to look. He has not even "kept us out of war," as he boasts, but, on the contrary, has made war inevitable by his strange course with so many nations; by his numerous "demands" made upon them; and by his invincible backward when they have refused to comply with those "demands," as he refused to comply with those "demands" of the United States. The seeds of war he has planted will bear fruit sooner or later, while a sensible and manly course would probably have avoided war, and would also have saved our self-respect.

Even if he is always sincere—which I have lately come to doubt very much—is it sensible, or even possible, to follow a man who changes his mind continually in almost everything? In the matter of preparedness he has gone through every change in the last few months, from the notion that nothing at all was needed to the foolish advocacy at his latest speech (as that was more than a week ago we have no way of knowing what he advocates to-day) of a navy "incomparably the strongest in the world." After spending millions and after his reelection—is he not just as likely to "change his mind" once more and again conclude that we do not need any at all, and to throw it all aside? In the light of what he has done, is he not as apt to do that as anything?

I also like very much what Mr. B. A. Gould says, and the way he says it, in his letter, "Never So Important," in the issue of February 8. I am, however, less hopeful than he is. It is a hard thing to say, but I am afraid the country has already "lost its soul." I am afraid Wilson has succeeded in bartering it for the hope of a second term for himself. As Mr. Gould says, the election will show whether this is true or not. Heaven help America if, knowing him as it now knows him, it is willing to take him for a second term.

W. B. WORRAILL.

West Branch, Iowa, Feb. 12, 1916.

He Doesn't Love the Doctors.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Regarding the Federation of State Medical Boards' proposed "sickness insurance" administered by the Federal government, which emanated from a recent meeting in Chicago, it is evident that the plan, from the standpoint of the medical profession, would be a mighty good deal to insure a greater practical income, at the expense of the dear, good people, in brief, as advocated by Dr. O. Hoffman in Chicago, it provides for a tax of \$2 a year on all wage earners receiving less than \$1,200 a year income. The great majority of wage earners receive less than \$1,200 annually, and this would "get" them nicely.

Is there anything new under the sun? Over in China the usual way of medical attention has been for ages for the natives to pay the doctors so much periodically in case sickness is kept away. When disease attacks the patient the doctor's fee is cancelled until health returns. This medical innovation for our country would be a handsome procedure for the profession, especially if the American Medical Association could get this kind of a law for insurance of fees buckled and bolted on to the state or Federal government.

Since there are many people of Christian Science faith who refuse to have any medical (drug) treatment whatever, and also there are many educated people who successfully treat any of their own natural ailments with homeopathic medicines, should not these people be exempt from paying any state or Federal medical tax, which, if provided, is meant to insure payment, by the government, of some other people's doctor's bills? I believe that the majority of people are not anxious for government by paternalism; in other words, let doctors continue to collect their bills in the usual way of other professionals.

C. W. WILSON.

Cumtosta, N. Y., Feb. 9, 1916.

Married Teachers.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: There are two married women in our neighborhood whose husbands can very well support them and yet both are teaching school and taking the places of young women who are eagerly waiting to be appointed.

There may be many reasons why these women continue to teach school, but there is one good enough to excuse them for being a stumbling block in the path of the newly graduated girl who has been working hard at training school in the hope that she would soon be able to occupy a position for which she had spent considerable energy, time and money in preparing herself, with the hope that it would present a profitable and congenial employment?

True, the married woman will say that she knows just how to handle the children, for she has handled so many; yet our younger women could handle them as well, for they have had the same instruction.

Married women who are drawn upon their own resources are justified in holding their positions, as a means of livelihood, but one who can be driven to her post in an automobile can find other means of endeavor by which she could be of more use to the community.

EDITH CLAIRE.

New York, Feb. 14, 1916.

Sharp Shod Horses.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: One would naturally suppose that horse owners here would have their teams sharp shod in the winter time or use some one of the numerous appliances made to prevent their slipping.

As a business proposition it would seem a necessity to thus protect all draft horses. As a humane proposition, however, such a thing would not appeal to 5 per cent of the owners of horses in this city, about 95 per cent of whom are responsible for the delays in traffic and general blockading of the streets whenever they are rendered slippery by snow or ice.

W. W. HALLOCK.

New York, Feb. 9, 1916.

With Interest and Approval.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have read the Ad-Visor column of Mr. Adams ever since its beginning with the greatest interest and approval—naturally so because my work is largely with the very people whose interests are concerned with the subject matter of that column. I have classes in training in all of the large department stores of New York and Brooklyn, and my constant endeavor is to get these young employees to see the relation between the buying public and the selling force. I have recently requested all of my teachers to take The Tribune regularly in order to get the information contained in your columns.

MRS. ANNA H. WILCOX.

Supervisor of Continuation Classes.

New York, Feb. 13, 1916.

THE ISSUE.



"THE ISSUE"

Tribune Readers Are Almost Unanimously Enthusiastic Regarding Ex-Senator Root's Speech at the Republican State Convention—They Agree with The Tribune That He Has Defined the Issue on Which the Presidential Campaign This Year Is To Be Fought.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Bravo for Mr. Root's speech! All hail! He has spoken out frankly, and it is as from the very heart of us.

Colonel Roosevelt has done so all along; but there should have been heard the voices of many more public men within the last year.

Unfortunately, the voicing of such a speech as Mr. Root's seems to be considered a particular form of bravery in these days. In truth, it is the only possible attitude to be taken by true Americans, and should, as a matter of course, have been taken instantaneously and proclaimed aloud, far and wide, long ago. "Neutrality between right and wrong is a wicked thing."

All thinkers—farsighted, level-headed men and women—have felt this keenly for long humiliating months; and editors of newspapers have written strongly upon this Wilson course of cowardice, blindness, selfishness. Yet it still goes on!

Why must we continue to accept it meekly? Why, indeed? If we, as the American people, do not resent it to the extent of acting, and remove it by force, we therefore, like Wilson himself, tolerate and condone—which is unappealing.

Apparently this is the case with us. But there is a smouldering fire in the American people! We need men in the proper position who shall at last stand up as one body and in the name of true American idealism demand that our false representative be repudiated. By so doing we could gain much of our lost self-respect, and reestablish, at least in part, our former dignified position among the first powers of the world.

What we need is the first word—a start—a leader—and the people would rise up and overthrow the whole false governing power. There is yet a year of Wilson leadership ahead of us. Must we have it? Who knows where it may place us? Is there not great danger? Why not prevent, instead of allowing calamity to overtake us? If we repudiate Wilson and the methods of the Administration in newspapers and in our hearts, why don't we impeach him?

ANNIE TRAQUIR LANG.

New York, Feb. 16, 1916.

America To-day.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Let me congratulate you on the beautiful editorial, "The Issue." Americans begin to see themselves as others see them; they are ashamed of the policy of the administration. But out of the Belgian, Lusitania, Arabic and Ancona horrors must spring the question: "Is there such an entity as the American Nation?"

Here were hundreds of persons, men, women and children, murdered in cold blood by a German demon who danced with delight at the news of so many innocent non-combatants perishing at his word of command; granted holidays to school children so that they might dance with him, while his people decorated their towns, and the whole nation rejoiced at the most fiendish outrages that have ever been committed. Among those murdered on passenger ships were over one hundred citizens of what is euphemistically called "The Great American Nation." It is almost inconceivable that a man can exist outside of Germany who, after outrages which have shocked civilization, can reckon up the loss of human life from the financial point of view and demand satisfaction in money; yet your President, American gentlemen, is that man.

There is no American nation in the modern sense of the word! There is a huge assemblage of the lowest, most ignorant part of foreign nations; a mass of people that came here to worship the almighty dollar; that have no other ideal except the making of more and more greenbacks! Your young generation knows only of baseball, saloons and "girls." The creed of an American is: "I believe in one mighty, most holy dollar and in his son the cent!" Everything you

measure by dollars: sugar, human lives, olives and souls! Everything is reduced to sounding, yellow gold! There was once an American nation, but that nation was buried with the heroes of Bunker Hill and Appomattox. The Americans of to-day are not the descendants of those that fought for liberty; no, sir, they are the sons of men that came here to accumulate dollars. Washington and Lincoln were the representatives of the former and Wilson represents the latter!

And when the rest of the world, outside the United States, says "President Wilson"—"America" is meant!

MICHAEL A. LAZAR.

New York, Feb. 15, 1916.

The Keynote.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: You are entitled to the thanks of all patriotic citizens for your publication of Mr. Root's speech of yesterday and your able editorial upon the same. The plain, logical statement of such an able citizen as Mr. Root upon a question so important to the citizens of this nation is of great value to the country at this time.

No one has had the courage to make such a statement before, except Colonel Roosevelt. Now that these two great leaders are at one as to the great principles which affect our country, we should all rally to save ourselves from the humiliation and disgrace into which we have fallen by reason of the inaction of our representatives at Washington as to the violation of Belgian neutrality, the torpedoing of merchant vessels without warning, thus murdering our citizens upon the high seas, and the weak policy of the Administration as to Mexico.

It is not a question of men, but a question of principles. The Entente Allies are really fighting our battles. In other words, they are contending for practically the same principles which we fought for who served in the armies of the nation during the Civil War—namely, the principles of democracy as against autocracy; the right of the people to rule instead of being ruled by those who hold their position by what they claim to be "the divine right of kings."

The keynote has been sounded by Mr. Root. There should be no faltering or division, but a patriotic demonstration by every citizen who believes in the principles for which our Revolutionary fathers fought; for which the "boys" from '61 to '65 fought, and for which this nation has always stood.

GEORGE W. BRUSH.

Brooklyn, Feb. 15, 1916.

An Illuminating Speech.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have just read the speech of Senator Root and your editorial, with both of which I agree.

Mr. Root's speech is the most illuminating I have ever read. It shows me most clearly why I feel as I do toward the Administration and why I should act as I intend to do in the future. I wish it could be printed in pamphlet form and sent to every voter in the United States. It would transform thousands upon thousands of uncertain, hesitating, groping men into clear-seeing, determined, courageous patriots. Can you not start the movement?

G. B. BEECHER.

New York, Feb. 16, 1916.

The Plain Truth.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Since I cannot thank Mr. Root in person for his denunciation of the Administration's policies, I want to express through your paper my gratitude to him and rejoicing that a man of his repute and influence has told the plain truth about Mr. Wilson, and I trust will have brought others to see it. Americans have seemed to me discouragingly indifferent, but it may well be that what they have needed is a leader, a spokesman. Now that they have found one, I hope for a better state of things.

M. L. HENRY.

Morristown, N. J., Feb. 16, 1916.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Anent "The Issue"—to-day's editorial. In the previous attempt to disrupt the Republican party the wreckers formed a club and therewith laid about him mightily, but the party lived. The present issue develops a method wherein the wretched ravisher plans to lay hold on the party and drag it bodily into the pro-Ally camp, from whence there would be no return. This proceeding would leave many parties and orphaned, therefore a council is in order advising the wise old men and the brisk young to devise ways and means to defend the G. O. P. against this brave ex-Senator, ex-Secretary of State and now executor of European manufactured sentiments. If party victory depends upon foreign politics, transposed to suit the convenience of a minority, it is proposed Americans capitulate and uphold such sentiments, then we will enter battle with decimated ranks. Our party's principal support, the labor and mercantile interests, who are most closely identified with the prosperity of the nation, cannot conceivably countenance a programme of re-entangling alliances, a delusion more rapid than any our history can produce.

Let us hope the matter is ended with the eruption at last night's convention. Otherwise har-kari will be a meaningless term compared with what would end our party.

LIFELONG REPUBLICAN.

New York, Feb. 16, 1916.

Inspired.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: "The Issue" in yesterday's Tribune, and Daniel Snively's letter for "Right and Theodore Roosevelt" in to-day's paper express my sentiments exactly. The minds that penned them were inspired, and if others are thrilled to patriotism by them as I am—surely, surely, America will awake once more.

One does not expect much in the way of loyalty or enthusiasm from those making the United States their abiding place